

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Formalities

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority or confirmed receipt of the certified copy of the priority document filed with the USPTO on September 25, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority and confirm receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

II. Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Lee. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lee fails to teach, at least "extracting the utilization result information that contains the initial information decided to be on the same level" and "generating the content management information about the object content based on the extracted utilization result information." Lee teaches that once a previously viewed program is found that is related to the current program, the inherent part of the description information relating to the current program is added to the information regarding the previously viewed program. (Lee, Para. [0041]). **At this point, the processing of the initial information of the current program is complete.** There is no teaching of "extracting the utilization result information that contains the initial information decided to be on the same level" or for that matter any other information. Further, there is no teaching of **"generating the content management information about the object content based on the extracted utilization result information."** In fact, the Examiner

cites no teaching in the reference corresponding to this limitation because the cited portions of the reference are a discussion of processing a third program and of a separate embodiment that only changes the structure of the description information. (Lee, Para. [0043], [0045], and [0046]). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee fails to teach every limitation of the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Lee. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and claims 3-8 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that independent claims 2, 9, 10, 17 and 18 and their dependant claims 11-16 and 19-24 are also patentable over Lee for the same reason or similar reasons. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2 and 9-24.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/669,652

Attorney Docket No.: Q77552

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/
Logan J. Brown
Registration No. 58,290

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 18, 2007